

## **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2007.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesy of an interview with Examiners Phillip H. Nguyen and Wei Y. Zhen on October 31, 2007. During the interview the participants discussed various amendments to Claims 1 and 5 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112. It was stated during the interview that the amendments made in this reply would be evaluated to determine if the claims, as amended, are allowable.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2007, Claims 1-34 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (US Pat. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0188036 A1) (hereinafter “Chen”).

### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments**

In response to Examiner's statements regarding allowable subject matter, Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27 and 30 have been amended and Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 33 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27 and 30 which were previously dependent claims have now been combined with the claims they depended from. Accordingly, Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27 and 30 are now presented as independent claims.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for using trademark or trade name “JAVA” as a limitation in the claims. These claims have been amended so that the trademark/trade name “JAVA” is no longer used.

The Examiner stated that “Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 32 and 34 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” These claims have been amended pursuant to Examiner's statement. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 32 and 34 are

allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**IV. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen. In an effort to place this application in a condition for allowance, these claims have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented and canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

**VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov. 1, 2007

By: /Rex Hwang/  
Rex Hwang  
Reg. No. 56206

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800